Case 1:02-cv-02917-JEI Document 525 Filed 01/17/13 Page 1 of 3 PageID: 16738

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

LLOYD K GARRISON (1946-1991) RANDOLPH E PAUL (1946-1956) SIMON H RIFKIND (1950-1995) LOUIS S WEISS (1927-1950) JOHN F WHARTON (1927-1977)

writer s direct dial number (212) 373-3163

writer's direct facsimile (212) 373-2399

writer's direct e-Mail address jaycohen@paulweiss.com

January 17, 2013

UNIT 3601, FORTUNE PLAZA OFFICE TOWER A
NO 7 DONG SANHUAN ZHONGLIO
CHAO YANG DISTRICT
BEIJING 100020
PEOPLE S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
TELEPHONE (86-10) 5828 6300

12TH FLOOR, HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING 3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL HONG KONG TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

> ALDER CASTLE 10 NOBLE STREET LONDON EC2V 7JU, U K TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING 2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2 CHOME CHIYODA-KU TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE
77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100
PO BOX 226
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5K 1J3
TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

2001 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047 TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

500 DELAWARE AVENUE, SUITE 200 POST OFFICE BOX 32 WILMINGTON DE 19899-0032 TELEPHONE (302) 655-4410 MATTHEW W ABBOTT
ALLAN J ARFFA
ROBERT A ATKINS
DAVID J BALL
JOHN F BAUGHMAN
JOHN F BAUGHMAN
JOHN F BAUGHMAN
JOHN F BAUGHMAN
MITCHELL BERG
MARK S BERGMAN
MERK S BERGMAN
BEUGE BIRCHER BOCHNING
ANGELO BONVINO
JAMES L BROCHIN
RICHARD J BRONSTEIN
DAVIO W BROWN FREEL
SAMPET BROWNING
JAMES L BROCHIN
RICHARD J BRONSTEIN
DAVIO W BROWN FREEL
SAMPET BROWNING
SAMPELL*
JESNICA S CARPELL*
JESNICA S CARPEY
JEANETTE K CHAN
YONNEY F CHAN
LEWIS R CLAYTON
JESNICA S CARREY
JESNICA

JEH C JOHNSON
MEREDITH J KANE
ROBERTA A KAPLAN
BRAIS KARNEDY
ALAN W KORNBERG
DANIEL J KRAMER
DAVID K LAKHDHIR
STEPHEN P LAMB*
JOHNEL J JEFFELL
XIAOYU GREG LIU
JEFFREY D MARELL
MARCO Y MASOTTI
EDWIN S MAYNARD
DELIZABETH R MCCOLM
MARK F MENDELSOHN
WILLIAM B MICHAEL
TOBY S MYERSON
CATHERINE NYARADY
JALEX YOUNG K OH
BRAD R OKUN
KELLEY D PARKER
MARC E PERLMUTTER
WARTER E RESORE
WALTER RIBMAN
MARCHENER SENBERG
ANDREEN ROSENBERG
ANDREEN ROSENBERG
WALTER G RICCIARDI
WALTER G RICCIARDI
WALTER G RICCIARDI
WALTER G SCHWEID
JEFFREY D SAFERSTEIN
JEFFREY D SAFERSTEIN
JEFFREY B SAMUELS
DALE M SACHOWER
ANDREEN ROSENBERG
JOHN M SCOTT
ROBERT B SCHUMER
KOBERT B SCHUMER
JOHN M SCOTT
STENBERG SCHWAB
JOHN M SCOTT
STEPHEN J SHMGHAK
DOSES SILVERMAN
NARIENTH SCHWAB
JOHN M SCOTT
ROBERT B SCHUMER
ROBERT SCHUMER
ROBERT B SCHUMER
ROBER
ROBERT B SCHUMER
ROBER
ROBERT B SCHUMER
ROBER
ROBER
ROBER
ROBER
ROBER
R

*NOT ADMITTED TO THE NEW YORK BAR

Via ECF

The Honorable Joseph E. Irenas, S.U.S.D.J. United States District Court for the District of New Jersey Mitchell H. Cohen Federal Building & U.S. Courthouse 1 John F. Gerry Plaza, Room 310 Camden, NJ 08101

> Re: Brady, et al. v. Air Line Pilots Association, Int'l Civil Action No. 02-2917 (D.N.J. Camden) (JEI)

Dear Judge Irenas:

We write in response to plaintiffs' letter of yesterday afternoon requesting a conference with the Court to address plaintiffs' motion for a protective order. In that motion, plaintiffs seek to prevent the depositions of two fact witnesses, John Hefley and Scott Schwartz, that the Court has already expressly authorized.

Pursuant to the Court's November 15, 2012 Order, ALPA is subject to a January 31, 2013 deadline for completing the depositions of Hefley and Schwartz, as well as the depositions of four additional TWA-related witnesses and plaintiffs' two experts. (Nov. 15, 2012 Order ¶¶ 1, 2.) As the Court recalls, this Order was issued following the November 15, 2012 Status Conference, during which ALPA sought and obtained the Court's permission to depose Hefley, Schwartz, and the other witnesses. (Nov. 15, 2012 Status Conference Tr. at 71; Nov. 15, 2012 Order ¶ 1.) During the Status Conference, Plaintiffs' counsel expressly stated that he had "no objection to the TWA discovery [ALPA] seek[s]." (Nov. 15, 2012 Tr. at 33.) And plaintiffs raised no objections at any

2

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

The Honorable Joseph E. Irenas, S.U.S.D.J.

time in the nearly two months that followed, even though the parties appeared again before the Court on January 4 in connection with defendant's motion to amend.

At the November 15 Conference, I detailed for the Court the reasons ALPA proposed to take these depositions, which are independent of their membership in the plaintiff class. (Nov. 15, 2012 Status Conference Tr. at 19-27.) Specifically, I explained that these witnesses would provide testimony demonstrating that "TWA had no options" and "was on the verge of bankruptcy," issues that go to the heart of plaintiffs' damages theory. (Nov. 15 Tr. at 26.) To support their theory of damages, plaintiffs' experts assert that the TWA pilots could have negotiated a better seniority integration list with the Allied Pilots' Association ("APA") because, they assume, the TWA pilots' "reasonable [pre-transaction career] expectations" were relatively high.

By virtue of their positions on the TWA Master Executive Council ("MEC"), Hefley and Schwartz have factual information relevant to this foundational assumption for the plaintiffs' expert reports. Schwartz was the Vice Chairman of the TWA MEC and even offered testimony during TWA's bankruptcy proceeding in support of American Airlines' acquisition of substantially all of TWA's assets. Hefley served on (and authored the minutes of) the TWA MEC's Merger Committee, which was charged with negotiating with the APA regarding seniority integration. We thus made clear at the conference that we were seeking to depose these witnesses not in their capacities as class members, but as percipient fact witnesses. In particular, in view of their positions, both witnesses are expected to have knowledge concerning, among other things, (i) TWA's perilous financial condition at the time of the transaction, (ii) the absence of any viable alternatives to American Airline's proposed asset acquisition, and (iii) the history of the negotiations between representatives of the TWA MEC and the APA regarding seniority integration. All of these issues bear directly on the viability of plaintiffs' speculative and counter-factual damage models. Notwithstanding their awareness of our rationale for these depositions and the status of Hefley and Schwartz as non-representative members of the class, Plaintiffs' counsel expressly stated at the Status Conference that he had no objections to this discovery. (Nov. 15, 2012 Tr. at 33.)

Moreover, when ALPA thereafter served plaintiffs' counsel, in their capacity as counsel for the class, with subpoenas for the depositions of Hefley and Schwartz on December 28, 2012, plaintiffs did not object on grounds of relevance or otherwise suggest they planned to seek a protective order. Instead, Plaintiffs' counsel told us that they (i) had no authority to accept service on behalf of class members; (ii) were not willing to contact Hefley or Schwartz to seek their authorization to accept service; and (iii) did not even know how to get in touch with Hefley or Schwartz, notwithstanding that they had recently finished mailing questionnaires to all class members. Plaintiffs' counsel therefore insisted that we serve Hefley and Schwartz personally. Accordingly, on January 8, 2013, we served Plaintiffs' counsel with notices of subpoenas for both witnesses and undertook to make personal service. Plaintiffs' counsel then waited an additional 2 days, until January 10, 2013, to file this motion.

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

The Honorable Joseph E. Irenas, S.U.S.D.J.

3

Based on the date when Plaintiffs' counsel filed their motion, this Court's local rules provided that the motion date would be February 4. Plaintiffs' counsel doubtless appreciated that—due to their needless and inexplicable decision to wait nearly two months after learning of our intent to depose Hefley and Schwartz before filing this motion—the motion date was 4 days *after* the deadline this Court had established for ALPA to complete their depositions.

As plaintiffs' letter acknowledges, ALPA has now managed to serve both Hefley and Schwartz with the subpoenas for their depositions. Hefley and Schwartz have each responded, indicating their willingness and availability to be deposed before the January 31 deadline. Hefley indicated that he is available on January 28, 29, or 30, and Schwartz indicated his availability on the date noticed in the subpoena, January 25. As we indicated in an email to plaintiffs' counsel, ALPA would like to proceed with these depositions in accordance with the schedule imposed by the Court. We also advised plaintiffs' counsel by email that ALPA planned to address the scheduling issues in its opposition to plaintiffs' pending motion for a protective order, but plaintiffs' counsel evidently decided to preempt that filing with the letter it sent yesterday.

Contrary to the suggestion of plaintiffs' counsel that ALPA somehow was trying to moot their motion by proceeding with the Hefley and Schwartz depositions before the Court had an opportunity to resolve the pending motion, ALPA had planned to propose an expedited briefing schedule. In particular, ALPA plans to file its opposition to plaintiffs' motion later today, significantly in advance of the January 22 due date prescribed by the Court's local rules. We would respectfully propose that plaintiffs file any reply by January 22, in the hope that doing so would permit the motion to be resolved prior to the scheduled depositions.

In the alternative, should the Court require additional time to consider and resolve this motion, we would respectfully request that the Court extend our time to complete these depositions.

Respectfully,

Jay Cohen / Agr Jay Cohen

cc: All counsel of record (via ECF)